

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims Rejections – 35 USC 112

5 Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Response:

Claim 5 has been amended to correct the typographical error, where “the coded result” is amended to read “the decoded result” now. No new matter is introduced.

10 **2. Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Sekiguchi et al. (US 6493385 B1).

Response:

Claim 1

15 Examiner states that the limitations recited in claim 1 are anticipated by Sekiguchi. The applicant disagrees and deems that the teachings of Sekiguchi are misinterpreted by examiner.

20 In col. 2, lines 6-45, Sekiguchi states that **each** of macro-blocks in a video VM8.0 is encoded in a **Bidirectionally predictive-Video Object Plane (B-VOP)**, and in the B-VOP coding which is not used for the prediction and in which it is sufficient to display a picture for a moment, the coding efficiency is undesirably lowered. Thus, in col. 2, lines 48-58, Sekiguchi states that his invention is to solve above-mentioned drawbacks of the video VM8.0 by providing a coding/decoding method and apparatus to perform coding/decoding without lowering the coding efficiency or picture quality. As a result, the coding method and apparatus taught by Sekiguchi is used to encode each of the input pictures into a B-VOP picture to generate a coded bit stream, and the decoding method and apparatus taught by
25 Sekiguchi is used to decode the coded bit stream composed of B-VOP pictures only.

Additionally, Sekiguchi teaches that an appropriate coding mode table is selected and then an optimum coding mode is selected from the selected coding mode table when an encoding operation is started (col. 11, lines 6-11). As shown in Sekiguchi Figs. 9, 10, 13-16, and 18, each table is labeled as “MBTYPE TABLE FOR B-VOP CODING”. Therefore, the coding modes listed in each table are dedicated to a **single** coding scheme, i.e., B-VOP coding. As a result, regarding the decoding apparatus shown in Sekiguchi Fig. 30, the MTYPE-1 table in the MTYPE-1 decoding unit (117) and the MTYPE-2 table in the MTYPE-2 decoding unit (118) are sure to be MBTYPE tables dedicated to B-VOP decoding. Therefore, the applicant asserts that the coding modes including intra-coding, bidirectional prediction, and both forward and backward prediction are unable to anticipate the claimed feature “a **predetermined plurality of different** video object plane (VOP) types (*emphasis added*)”. As a result, the applicant asserts that the cited decoding apparatus of Sekiguchi configured for decoding B-VOP pictures only is unable to anticipate the claimed decoding module capable of decoding a **predetermined signal in each of the predetermined plurality of different VOP types** (*emphasis added*).

In light of above statements, the applicant believes the rejections under 102(a) have been overcome. Reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 2-4, 7-9, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekiguchi et al. (US 6493385 B1).

Response:

Claims 2-4 and 7-9

Referring to above statements under Claim 1, the claimed feature “a **predetermined plurality of different** video object plane (VOP) types (*emphasis added*)” recited in claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by Sekiguchi. The applicant therefore asserts that limitations recited in claims 2-4 and 7-9 are neither taught nor suggested by Sekiguchi. In short, claims 2-4 and 7-9 are dependent upon claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 16

In light of above statements, the applicant asserts that the claimed feature “decoding a predetermined signal in the **different types** of VOP (*emphasis added*)” is neither taught nor suggested by Sekiguchi. Therefore, another claimed feature “accessing a lookup table
5 **specifically corresponding to the indicated type** of VOP (*emphasis added*)” is not anticipated by Sekiguchi, either. As the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been overcome, claim 16 has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-20

10 Similarly, as claims 17-20 are dependent upon claim 16, claims 17-20 should be allowed if claim 16 is found allowable.

Claims 5, 6, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekiguchi et al. (US 6493385 B1) as applied to claims 1-4, 7-9, and 16-20 above, and further
15 in view of Chen (US 6043838 A).

Response:

Claims 5 and 6

Claims 5 and 6 are dependent upon claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

20 Claim 10

Claim 10 includes limitations of the claimed multiplexer. Examiner states that the claimed multiplexer is anticipated by Chen. The applicant disagrees. As shown in Fig. 1 and stated in col. 5, lines 52-59, Chen teaches using the temporal remultiplexer (140) to **combine** outputs of the enhancement decoder (130) and the lower decoder (135). Therefore, the cited
25 temporal remultiplexer is used to combine a plurality of inputs into a single output, instead of selecting one of the inputs as the output. However, in claim 10, the claimed multiplexer is connected to a memory and the claimed switching circuit is connected to the multiplexer for controlling **which decoded result** is transmitted to the memory (*emphasis added*). The

applicant asserts the temporal remultiplexer taught by Chen is unable to anticipated the claimed multiplexer.

Additionally, in light of above statements under Claim 1, the applicant asserts the claimed feature “ each video decoding module capable of decoding a predetermined signal in
5 a **Data-partitioned intra video object plane (DP-I VOP)** and capable of decoding the predetermined signal in a **Data partitioned predicted video object plane (DP-P VOP)**” is neither taught nor suggested by Sekiguchi’s disclosure which teaches decoding the B-VOP pictures only. In short, the limitations in claim 10 are not taught or suggested by Sekiguchi in view of Chen. Reconsideration of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

10 Claims 11-15

Claims 11-15 are dependent upon claim 10, and should be allowed if claim 10 is found allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

15

Sincerely yours,



Date: 05.25.2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

20 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

25 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)